

REMARKS

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present application. Independent claim 1, and claims 2-12, 16-20, and 28-34 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to an optical film. Independent claims 13-15, and 21-27 dependent directly or indirectly thereon, are directed to a liquid crystal display.

In the Office Action, the following rejections are set forth:

- Claims 1-7, 11, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP61-32005 to Kato (“Kato”) in view of JP 6-59123 (“Yoshimi”);
- Claims 1, 6-7, 11, and 19-20 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over US 6,111,697 to Merrill (“Merrill”) in view of Yoshimi;
- Claims 8-10, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kato and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,498,633 to Ozeki et al. (“Ozeki”);
- Claims 12, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kato and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,088,079 to Kameyama et al. (“Kameyama”);
- Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kato and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,654,085 to Koike (“Koike”);
- Claims 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Kato and Yoshimi, further in view of US 6,094,245 to Ochi et al. (“Ochi”);
- Claims 13, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over JP 11-64631 to Okumura (“Okumura”) in view of Yoshimi;
- Claims 14-15, and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Okumura in view of Kato and Yoshimi.

It is alleged in substance in the Office Action that Kato, Merrill, and Okumura each disclose a polarizing plate with two polarizers, and that it would have been obvious to use the polarizers of Yoshimi having 99% polarization degree.

The rejections are respectfully traversed.

As a preliminary, contrary to the interpretation set forth on page 2, last paragraph of the Office Action, Yoshimi fails to disclose a polarizing film having a first portion and second portion. In other words, the interpretation according to which Yoshimi discloses a double-layered polarizer is erroneous.

Turning in particular to the Figures of Yoshimi, Figs. 1-4 show a polarizing plate (4) having a single polarizing layer (2) with one or both sides covered by a protective layer (1) and/or phase contrast film (5). Next, Figs. 5-7 show a liquid crystal cell (6) with polarizing plates (4) on both sides of the liquid crystal cell (6). However, on each side of the liquid crystal cell (6), there is only one polarizing plate (4), as is conventional in the art.

Further, there is no suggestion in Yoshimi to provide plural polarizing layers on one side of the liquid crystal cell. In particular, Applicants urge that the English translation of paragraph [0020] of Yoshimi, which was submitted with the Amendment filed January 13, 2005, as well as the explanations regarding this paragraph in the Remarks of the Amendment of January 13, 2005, make clear that the person of ordinary skill in the art would have understood paragraph [0020] of Yoshimi by reference to the drawings and the conventional knowledge. Thus, Yoshimi is completely silent regarding a double-layered polarizer.

In contrast, the present inventors have discovered that, by laminating a polarizer having a high polarization degree at the short wavelength side (420 nm to 550 nm) and a polarizer having a

high polarization degree at the long wavelength side (550 nm to 700 nm), as recited in present claims 1 and 13-15, it is possible to obtain a polarizing plate having a high polarization degree at both the long and the short wavelength side. Thus, the presently claimed invention makes it possible to solve a problem of the prior art in which a high polarization degree could not be obtained at either the long or the short wavelength side.

In addition, with respect to the dependent claims, the combinations of features recited in these respective claims are not taught or suggested in the cited references taken alone or in any combination. Therefore, for these respective reasons alone, the dependent claims are not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In particular, with respect to claims 19-20, it is submitted that the cited references are completely silent regarding the features recited in these respective claims (polarization degrees of 99.3% or more or 99.5% or more, respectively, at each wavelength of light for wavelengths of 420 to 550 nm for the first portion, and at each wavelength of light for a wavelengths of 550 to 700 nm for the second portion). Therefore, for these respective reasons alone, each of claims 19-20 is not obvious over the cited references taken alone or in any combination.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the rejections should be withdrawn.

In conclusion, the invention as presently claimed is patentable. It is believed that the claims are in allowable condition and a notice to that effect is earnestly requested.

In the event there is, in the Examiner's opinion, any outstanding issue and such issue may be resolved by means of a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial Number: 10/001,709

Group Art Unit: 2826

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of the response period. Please charge the fee for such extension and any other fees which may be required to our Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Nicolas E. Seckel
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 44,373

Atty. Docket No. 020582

Customer No.: 38834

1250 Connecticut Avenue NW Suite 700

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 822-1100

Fax: (202) 822-1111

NES:rep